

REMARKS

The foregoing amendments to the specification and claims are intended to place the application in condition for allowance. Specifically, the specification has been corrected, Claims 1-7, 21, 22 and 28-30 have been canceled, and Claims 8, 11, 12, 23, 24, 26, 31-35 and 47 have been amended. In view of these amendments and the following reasoning for allowance, the applicants hereby respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the subject application.

The specification was objected to as being informal because of the phrase "Conversely, if the difference is negative positive," found on Page 7, line 10. The preceding sentence which reads "If the difference is positive, the new horizontal coordinate of the point is located to the right of the current position by the amount of the computed change" makes it clear that the phrase should read "Conversely, if the difference is negative". The specification has been corrected accordingly via the foregoing amendment.

Claim 47 was objected to as being informal. Claims 1-7, 12-14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 26, 28-30, 32-37, 40, 41, 45 and 46 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Arai, U.S. Patent No. 6,121,977, in view of Colwell, U.S. Patent No. 5,877,777. And finally, Claims 8-11, 15, 17, 20, 23-25, 27, 31, 38, 39, 42-44 and 47 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner stated that these last claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

While no admission is made that the rejected claims are actually made obvious by the cited references, the applicants have chosen to amend the claims as suggested in the Office Action to further the prosecution of the application and expedite its allowance. More particularly, the rejected Claims 1-7, 21, 22 and 28-

30 have been cancelled, and Claims 8-20, 23-27 and 31-47 have been either rewritten to include all of the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims, or made dependent from such rewritten claims. Further, in regard to Claim 47, which was objected to for having a confusing preamble, the phrase "for each vertex of the grid associated with the combined texture map of the next frame to be rendered" has been deleted to clarify the language of the claim.

In summary, it is believed that the specification and remaining claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the specification and Claims 8-11, 15, 17, 20, 23-25, 27, 31, 38, 39, 42-44 and 47, reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 12-14, 16, 18, 19, 26, 32-37, 40, 41, 45 and 46 in view of the changes made in dependency, and allowance of all these claims at an early date, is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard T. Lyon
Registration No. 37,385
Attorney for Applicant

LYON & HARR, LLP
300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 800
Oxnard, CA 93036
(805) 278-8855